NOMENCLATURAL NOTES ON HOUSTONIA (RUBIACEAE)

Edward E. Terrell
Department of Botany, University of Maryland,
College Park, Maryland 20742

In the course of continued study of <u>Houstonia</u> I found the following nomenclatural changes and notes to be necessary.

1. <u>Houstonia ouachitana</u> (E. B. Smith) Terrell, comb. nov., based on <u>Hedyotis</u> <u>ouachitana</u> E. B. Smith, Brittonia 28: 457. 1976.

This transfer of a member of the <u>Houstonia</u> <u>purpurea</u> group is in accord with my previous work on <u>Houstonia</u>. The relationships of <u>Hedyotis</u>, <u>Houstonia</u>, and <u>Oldenlandia</u> were discussed by Terrell (1975). The type species of these genera represent three different extremes, and union of these three genera under <u>Hedyotis</u>, as sometimes suggested, would create an unreasonably heterogeneous genus. The 39 North American species of <u>Houstonia</u> are themselves a varied assemblage, as shown by data from seed types, chromosome numbers, and pollen morphology (Terrell et al., 1985). I plan to publish on these subjects elsewhere in further support of the genus <u>Houstonia</u>.

2. Neotypification of <u>Houstonia longifolia</u>
Gaertner, Fruct. Sem. Pl. 1: 226. Tab. XLIX. 1788.

It was noted previously (Terrell, 1959) that Gaertner's (1788) description and drawings of fruits and seeds (only) of <u>H</u>. <u>longifolia</u> could just as well apply to any member of the <u>H</u>. <u>purpurea</u> group, viz., <u>H</u>. <u>purpurea</u> L., <u>H</u>. <u>canadensis</u> Willd. ex Roem. & Schult., <u>H</u>. <u>tenuifolia</u> Nutt., <u>H</u>. <u>ouachitana</u>, or <u>H</u>. <u>longifolia</u>. The only reference to a specimen is "ex herbario Banksiano". I have not found any pertinent specimen in the herbaria of BM or K. The Tübingen (TUB) herbarium, the repository for Gaertner specimens, does not have any material of Gaertner's <u>H</u>. <u>longifolia</u> (correspondence from F. R. Oberwinkler, 22 Nov 1982).

Willdenow (Sp. Pl. 1 (2): 583-584. 1798) described <u>Houstonia longifolia</u> as a new species, while citing Gaertner's binomial followed by a question mark. Willdenow's description and a specimen (microfiche 2685, US!, inscribed "Houstonia longifolia foliis lanceolatis utrinque attenuatis, floribus corymbosis") in the Willdenow Herbarium, Berlin (B),

agree with the present concept of \underline{H} . $\underline{longifolia}$, a rather common species in the eastern and central parts of the United States. In the interests of nomenclatural stability it seems advisable to neotypify (Articles 7.4, 7.8, Voss et al., 1983) \underline{H} . $\underline{longifolia}$ Gaertner on the Willdenow description and specimen.

3. <u>Houstonia wrightii</u> A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 17: 202. 1882.

Hedyotis pygmaea Roem. & Schult., Syst. Veg. 3: 526. 1818. (non Houstonia pygmaea C. H. and M. T. Muller, 1936).

Hedyotis cervantesii H. B. K., Nov. Gen. Sp. 3: 390. 1820. Nom. illegit.

Houstonia wrightii, a member of the H. rubra group, is a small herb that occurs at higher altitudes in the southwestern United States southward to central Mexico. When placed in Hedyotis, the name Hedyotis pygmaea is correct (Lewis, 1966). As implied in the above synonymy, the name Hedyotis pygmaea cannot be legally transferred to Houstonia because of an earlier use of the epithet under Houstonia for a different species. In recent years I supposed for a time that Hedyotis cervantesii, the next available binomial, would have to be transferred to Houstonia. Meanwhile, the name <u>Hedyotis</u> cervantesii was taken up by Rzedowski (1985) in a flora of the valley of Mexico. The purpose of this note is to point out that the name Hedyotis cervantesii is illegitimate because it was superfluous when published (Art. 63, Voss et al., 1983). Hedyotis pygmaea and H. cervantesii were described independently from Mexican material obtained during the Humboldt and Bonpland expedition and are based on the same type specimen (see McVaugh's 1955 discussion). Photos of the type material in the herbaria of Berlin (B) and Paris (P) have been examined and will be discussed in detail elsewhere.

Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Drs. D. H. Nicolson and F. R. Fosberg (US), of F. R. Oberwinkler (TUB), and J. L. Reveal (MARY). This paper is Scientific Article No. A-4816, Contribution No. 7842, of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station.

Literature Cited

- Lewis, W. H. 1966. The Asian genus <u>Neanotis</u> nomen novum (<u>Anotis</u>) and allied taxa in the Americas (Rubiaceae). Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 53: 32-46.
- McVaugh, R. 1955. The American collections of Humboldt and Bonpland, as described in the Systema Vegetabilium of Roemer and Schultes. Taxon 4: 78-86.
- Terrell, E. E. 1959. A revision of the <u>Houstonia</u>
 purpurea group (Rubiaceae). Rhodora 61: 157-180;
 188-207.
- ______. 1975. Relationships of <u>Hedyotis</u> <u>fruticosa</u> L. to <u>Houstonia</u> L. and <u>Oldenlandia</u> L. Phytologia 31: 418-421.
- W. H. Lewis, H. Robinson, and J. W. Nowicke. 1986. Phylogenetic implications of diverse seed types, chromosome numbers, and pollen morphology in <u>Houstonia</u> (Rubiaceae). Amer. J. Bot. 73: 103-115.
- Rzedowski, J. 1985. Rubiaceae, pp. 390-402, in,
 Rzedowski, J. and G. C. de Rzedowski, eds. Flora
 Fanerogamica del Valle de Mexico. Inst. Ecol.,
 Mexico, D. F.
- Voss, E. G., Chairman, et al. 1983. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Bohn, Scheltema, and Holkema, Utrecht, The Netherlands.